arXiv:0807.1177v1 [math.AP] 8 Jul 2008

MAGNETIC VORTICES FOR A GINZBURG-LANDAU TYPE ENERGY WITH DISCONTINUOUS CONSTRAINT. II

HASSEN AYDI AND AYMAN KACHMAR

Abstract. We study vortex nucleation for minimizers of a Ginzburg-Landau energy with discontinuous constraint. For applied magnetic fields comparable with the first critical field of vortex nucleation, we determine the limiting vorticities.

1. Introduction and main results

In the framework of the Ginzburg-Landau theory, it is proposed to model the energy of an inhomogeneous superconducting sample by means of the following functional (see [3, 10])

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi,A)=\int_\Omega\left(|(\nabla-iA)\psi|^2+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}(p(x)-|\psi|^2)^2+|\operatorname{curl}A-H|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{1.1}$$

Here, $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ is the 2-D cross section of the superconducting sample, assumed to occupy a cylinder of infinite height. The complex-valued function $\psi\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ is called the 'order parameter', whose modulus $|\psi|^2$ measures the density of the superconducting electron Cooper pairs (hence $\psi\equiv0$ corresponds to a normal state), and the real vector field $A=(A_1,A_2)$ is called the 'magnetic potential', such that the induced magnetic field in the sample corresponds to $\operatorname{curl}A$.

The functional (1.1) depends on many parameters: $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}=\kappa$ is a characteristic of the superconducting sample (a temperature independent quantity), $H\geq0$ is the intensity of the applied magnetic field (assumed constant and parallel to the axis of the superconducting sample), $p(x)$ is a positive function modeling the impurities in the sample, whose values are temperature dependent. The positive sign of the function p means that the temperature remains below the critical temperature of the superconducting sample.

In this paper, the function p is a step function. We take S_1 an open smooth set such that $\overline{S}_1\subset\Omega$, $S_2=\Omega\setminus\overline{S}_1$, and

$$p(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}1 & \text{if } x\in S_1\,,\\ a & \text{if } x\in S_2\,,\end{array}\right. \tag{1.2}$$

where $a\in\mathbb{R}_+\setminus\{1\}$ is a given constant.

The above choice of p has two physical interpretations (see [6, 10]):

- S_1 and S_2 correspond to two superconducting samples with different critical temperatures;
- The superconducting sample Ω is subject to two different temperatures in the regions S_1 and S_2, which may happen by cold or heat working S_2.

Minimization of the functional (1.1) will take place in the space

$$\mathcal{H}=H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})\times H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)\,.$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35J60; Secondary 35J20, 35J25, 35B40, 35Q55, 82D55.

That is we do not assume *a priori* boundary conditions for admissible configurations, but minimizers satisfy *natural boundary conditions.* We study nucleation of vortices as the applied magnetic field varies in such a manner that,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{H}{|\ln\varepsilon|}=\lambda\,,\quad \lambda\in\mathbb{R}_+\,,$$

and we obtain that their behavior is strongly dependent on the parameter a, see Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 below.

The singularity of the potential p causes a singularity in the energy as $\varepsilon\to 0$ of the order of ε^{-1}, whereas the energy due to the presence of n vortices typically diverges like $n\ln\varepsilon$. In order to separate the different singularities of the energy, we let u_ε be the (unique) positive minimizer of (1.1) when $H=0$ (see Theorem 2.1), the energy of u_ε being of the order ε^{-1}. Then, if (ψ,A) is a minimizing configuration of (1.1), it holds that (see Lemma 2.3),

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi,H)=\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,0}(u_\varepsilon,0)+\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}\left(\frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon},A\right)\,,$$

and the configuration $\left(\dfrac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon},A\right)$ minimizes the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$ introduced below,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)=\int_\Omega\left(u_\varepsilon^2|(\nabla-iA)\varphi|^2+\frac{u_\varepsilon^4}{2\varepsilon^2}(1-|\varphi|^2)^2+|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{1.3}$$

The leading order term of the minimizing energy of (1.3) will be described by means of an auxiliary energy introduced in (1.5) below. Let $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ be the space of bounded Radon measures on Ω, i.e. the topological dual of $C_0^0(\Omega)$. A measure $\mu\in\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ can be represented canonically as a difference of two positive measures, $\mu=\mu_+-\mu_-$. The *total variation* and the *norm* of μ, denoted respectively by $|\mu|$ and $\|\mu\|$, are by definition $|\mu|=\mu_++\mu_-$ and $\|\mu\|=|\mu|(\Omega)$.

Given $\lambda>0$, we introduce an energy E_λ defined on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)\cap H^{-1}(\Omega)$ as follows. For $\mu\in\mathcal{M}(\Omega)\cap H^{-1}(\Omega)$, let $h_\mu\in H^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_\mu\right)+h_\mu=\mu & \text{in }\Omega\,,\\ h_\mu=1 \quad \text{on }\partial\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where p is introduced in (1.2). Now $E_\lambda(\mu)$ is by definition

$$E_\lambda(\mu)=\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega p(x)|\mu|\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}|\nabla h_\mu|^2+|h_\mu-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{1.5}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Given $\lambda>0$, assume that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{H}{|\ln\varepsilon|}=\lambda\,,$$

then

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}}{H^2}\to E_\lambda$$

in the sense of Γ-convergence. Here the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$ is defined in (1.3) above.

The convergence in Theorem 1.1 is precisely described in Propositions 3.1 and 4.1 below.

Minimizers of (1.5) can be characterized by means of minimizers of the following problem,

$$\min_{\substack{h\in H_0^1(\Omega)\\ -\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h\right)+h\in\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}}\int_\Omega\left(\frac{p(x)}{\lambda}\left|-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h\right)+h+1\right|+\frac{|\nabla h|^2}{p(x)}+|h|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{1.6}$$

The above functional being strictly convex and continuous, it admits a unique minimizer, and so the functional E_λ.
Therefore, as a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we may describe the limiting vorticity measure in terms of the minimizer of the limiting energy E_λ.

Theorem 1.2. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1, if $(\varphi_\varepsilon, A_\varepsilon)$ is a minimizer of (1.3), then, denoting by*

$$h_\varepsilon = \operatorname{curl} A_\varepsilon\,, \quad \mu_\varepsilon = h_\varepsilon + \operatorname{curl}(i\varphi_\varepsilon\,,\,(\nabla - iA_\varepsilon)\varphi_\varepsilon)\,,$$

the 'induced magnetic field' and 'vorticity measure' respectively, the following convergence hold,

$$\frac{\mu_\varepsilon}{H} \to \mu_* \quad \text{in } \left(C^{0,\gamma}(\Omega)\right)^* \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in (0,1)\,, \tag{1.7}$$

$$\frac{h_\varepsilon}{H} \to h_{\mu_*} \quad \text{weakly in } H^1_1(\Omega) \text{ and strongly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega)\,,\ \forall\, p < 2\,. \tag{1.8}$$

Here μ_* is the unique minimizer of E_λ.

Sketch of Proof.
Let us briefly describe the main points of the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and thus explain what stands behind their statements.
The starting point is the analysis of minimizers of (1.1) when $H = 0$. In this case, (1.1) has, up to a gauge transformation, a unique minimizer $(u_\varepsilon, 0)$ where u_ε is a positive real-valued function. The asymptotic decay of u_ε as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is obtained in Lemma 2.2.
When $H > 0$, let (ψ, A) be a minimizer of (1.1). Inspired by Lassoued-Mironescu [9], we introduce a *normalized density*[1]

$$\varphi = \frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}\,.$$

Then $|\varphi| \le 1$ and we are led to the analysis of the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A)$. The main difficulty stems from the boundary layer behavior of the weight u_ε, which has rapid oscillations comparable to ε^{-1} near the boundary of S_1. The challenge is then to construct a test configuration with vortices localized near ∂S_1 and having the right amount of energy. Technically, one does that via a Green's potential G_ε which we were not able to give a good control of it, see Lemma 3.2. To overcome this difficulty, we construct vortices situated at a distance $\frac{\ln|\ln\varepsilon|}{|\ln\varepsilon|}$ away from ∂S_1. Those vortices being expected to lie on a union γ of closed curves, a nice L^1 bound can be shown to hold for $G_\varepsilon(x,x)$ on γ. Then, using a result of [6], recalled in Lemma 3.4, this L^1 bound provides us with a family of well separated points serving as the centers of vortices for the test configurations, see Proposition 3.5. We use then suitable methods to estimate from above the energy of the constructed configuration, yielding in Proposition 3.1 the first part of Theorem 1.1. This rough analysis will be carried out through Section 3.
In Section 4, we establish a lower bound of the energy, see Proposition 4.1. This yields the second part of Theorem 1.1.
The proof of Theorem 1.2 is a by-product of the proofs of Propositions 3.1 and 4.1, see Remark 4.3. Finally, we close the paper with a discussion concerning the minimization of the energy (1.5).
Remarks on the notation.

- The letters $C, \widetilde{C}, M$, etc. will denote positive constants independent of ε.
- For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $|X|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of X. $B(x,r)$ denotes the open ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of radius r and center x.

---

[1] Notice that φ and ψ have the same vortices.

- $(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the scalar product in $\mathbb{C}$ when identified with $\mathbb{R}^2$.
- $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A,U)$ means that the energy density of (φ,A) is integrated only on $U\subset\Omega$.
- For $\alpha\in(0,1)$ sufficiently small, $S_1^\alpha=\{x\in S_1\ :\ \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial S_1)\geq\alpha\}$ and $S_2^\alpha=\{x\in S_2\ :\ \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial S_1)\geq\alpha\}$.
- For two positive functions $a(\varepsilon)$ and $b(\varepsilon)$, we write $a(\varepsilon)\ll b(\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon\to0$ to mean that $\displaystyle\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\frac{a(\varepsilon)}{b(\varepsilon)}=0$.

2. Preliminary analysis of minimizers

2.1. **The case without applied magnetic field.** This section is devoted to an analysis for minimizers of (1.1) when the applied magnetic field $H=0$. We follow closely similar results obtained in [7].
We keep the notation introduced in Section 1. Upon taking $A=0$ and $H=0$ in (1.1), one is led to introduce the functional

$$\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(u):=\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla u|^2+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}(p(x)-u^2)^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,, \tag{2.1}$$

defined for functions in $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$.
We introduce

$$C_0(\varepsilon)=\inf_{u\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(u)\,. \tag{2.2}$$

The next theorem is an analogue of Theorem 1.1 in [7].

Theorem 2.1. *Given $a\in\mathbb{R}_+\setminus\{1\}$, there exists ε_0 such that for all $\varepsilon\in]0,\varepsilon_0[$, the functional (2.1) admits in $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ a minimizer $u_\varepsilon\in C^2(\overline{S_1})\cup C^2(\overline{S_2})$ such that*

$$\min(1,\sqrt{a}\,)<u_\varepsilon<\max(1,\sqrt{a}\,)\quad\text{in }\overline{\Omega}.$$

If $H=0$, minimizers of (1.1) are gauge equivalent to the state $(u_\varepsilon,0)$.

We state also some estimates, taken from [7, Proposition 5.1], that describe the decay of u_ε away from the boundary of S_1.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $k\in\mathbb{N}$. There exist positive constants ε_0, δ and C such that, for all $\varepsilon\in]0,\varepsilon_0]$,*

$$\left\|(1-u_\varepsilon)\exp\left(\frac{\delta\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial S_1)}{\varepsilon}\right)\right\|_{H^k(S_1)}+\left\|(\sqrt{a}-u_\varepsilon)\exp\left(\frac{\delta\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial S_1)|}{\varepsilon}\right)\right\|_{H^k(S_2)}\leq\frac{C}{\varepsilon^k}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Finally, we mention without proof that the energy $C_0(\varepsilon)$ (cf. (2.2)) has the order of ε^{-1}, and we refer to the methods in [7, Section 6] which permit to obtain the leading order asymptotic expansion

$$C_0(\varepsilon)=\frac{c_1(a)}{\varepsilon}+c_2(a)+o(1),\quad(\varepsilon\to0),$$

where $c_1(a)$ and $c_2(a)$ are positive explicit constants.

2.2. **The case with magnetic field.** This section is devoted to a preliminary analysis of the minimizers of (1.1) when $H\neq0$. The main point that we shall show is how to extract the singular term $C_0(\varepsilon)$ (cf. (2.2)) from the energy of a minimizer.

Notice that the existence of minimizers is standard starting from a minimizing sequence (cf. e.g. [4]). A standard choice of gauge permits one to assume that the magnetic potential satisfies

$$\operatorname{div}A=0\quad\text{in }\Omega,\qquad n\cdot A=0\quad\text{on }\partial\Omega, \tag{2.4}$$

where n is the outward unit normal vector of $\partial\Omega$.
With this choice of gauge, one is able to prove (since the boundaries of Ω and S_1 are smooth) that a minimizer (ψ, A) is in $C^1(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{C}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^2)$. One has also the following regularity (cf. [7, Appendix A]),

$$\psi \in C^2(\overline{S}_1;\mathbb{C}) \cup C^2(\overline{S}_2;\mathbb{C}), \quad A \in C^2(\overline{S}_1;\mathbb{R}^2) \cup C^2(\overline{S}_2;\mathbb{R}^2).$$

The next lemma is inspired from the work of Lassoued-Mironescu (cf. [9]).

Lemma 2.3. *Let (ψ, A) be a minimizer of (1.1). Then $0 \leq |\psi| \leq u_\varepsilon$ in Ω, where u_ε is the positive minimizer of (2.1).*
Moreover, putting $\varphi = \frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$, then the energy functional (1.1) splits in the form :

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi, A) = C_0(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A), \tag{2.5}$$

where $C_0(\varepsilon)$ has been introduced in (2.2) and the new functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$ is defined by :

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) = \int_\Omega \left(u_\varepsilon^2 |(\nabla - iA)\varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} u_\varepsilon^4 (1 - |\varphi|^2)^2 + |\operatorname{curl} A - H|^2 \right) \mathrm{d}x.$$

3. Upper bound of the energy

3.1. **Main result.** The objective of this section is to establish the following upper bound.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon\to 0} \dfrac{H}{|\ln \varepsilon|} = \lambda$ with $\lambda > 0$. Given $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \cap H^{-1}(\Omega)$, there exists a family of configurations $\{(\varphi_\varepsilon, A_\varepsilon)\}_\varepsilon$ in $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C}) \times H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\|\varphi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$,*

$$\frac{\mu(\varphi_\varepsilon, A_\varepsilon)}{H} \rightharpoonup \mu \quad \text{in } \left(C_0^{0,\gamma}(\Omega)\right)^* \quad \forall\, \gamma \in (0,1), \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} F_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon, A_\varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_\Omega p(x)|\mu| \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{p(x)} |\nabla h_\mu|^2 + |h_\mu - 1|^2 \right) \mathrm{d}x\,.$$

3.2. **Analysis of a Green's potential.** This section is devoted to an analysis of a Green's kernel, i.e. a fundamental solution of the differential operator $-\operatorname{div}\left(\dfrac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}\nabla\right) + 1$. The existence and the properties of this function, taken from [1, 13], are given in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For every $y \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon \in]0,1]$, there exists a unique symmetric function $\Omega \times \Omega \ni (x,y) \mapsto G_\varepsilon(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that :*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{r} -\operatorname{div}\left(\dfrac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)} \nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\right) + G_\varepsilon(x,y) = \delta_y(x) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega), \\ G_\varepsilon(x,y)\big|_{x\in\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{array} \right. \tag{3.2}$$

Moreover, G_ε satisfies the following properties:

1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*
   $$G_\varepsilon(x,y) \leq C\left(|\ln|x-y|| + 1\right), \quad \forall\, (x,y) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega} \setminus \Delta\,, \ \forall\, \varepsilon \in]0,1]\,,$$
   where Δ denotes the diagonal in $\mathbb{R}^2$.
2. *The function $v_\varepsilon : \Omega \times \Omega \ni (x,y) \mapsto G_\varepsilon(x,y) + \dfrac{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}{2\pi} \ln|x-y|$ is in the class $C^1(\Omega \times \Omega;\mathbb{R})$.*
3. *Given $q \in [1,2[$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*
   $$\|v_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \forall\, y \in \overline{\Omega}, \quad \forall\, \varepsilon \in]0,1]\,.$$

One feature of the function G_ε is that we know its homogenized limit G_0.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $1<q<2$. The function G_ε converges weakly in $W^{1,q}(\Omega\times\Omega)$ to G_0 the solution of*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{r}-\mathrm{div}\left(\dfrac{1}{p(x)}\nabla_x G_0(x,y)\right)+G_0(x,y)=\delta_y(x)\quad\text{in }\mathcal{D}'(\Omega),\\ G_0(x,y)\big|_{x\in\partial\Omega}=0.\end{array}\right.\tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, G_ε converges locally uniformly to G_0 in $\Omega\times\Omega\setminus\Delta$ where Δ is the diagonal of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proof. Since G_ε and G_0 are symmetric, it is sufficient to establish weak convergence of $G_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)$ for $y\in\Omega$ arbitrarly fixed.
Lemma 3.2 assures that $G_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)$ is bounded in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ uniformly with respect to y and ε. Hence, $G_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)$ converges weakly to a function $G_0(\cdot,y)$ in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. Let us prove that G_0 solves (3.3).
Let $\varphi\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. It is sufficient to prove that as $\varepsilon\to0$,

$$\int_\Omega\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\to\int_\Omega\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla_x G_0(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$$
$$\int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(x,y)\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\to\int_\Omega G_0(x,y)\,\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\,.$$

The second convergence is actually immediate since $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ comapctly embedds in $L^q(\Omega)$ and $G_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)$ converges weakly to $G_0(\cdot,y)$ in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. In order to prove the first convergence we notice that,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x-\int_\Omega\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla_x G_0(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad=\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}-\frac{1}{p(x)}\right)\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\qquad+\int_\Omega\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla_x\left(\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(x,y)-G_0(x,y)\right)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\,,\end{aligned}$$

so it suffices to prove that

$$\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}-\frac{1}{p(x)}\right)\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\to0\quad\text{as }\varepsilon\to0\,.$$

Using the uniform bound on $G_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)$ in $W^{1,q}$, we write,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega\left|\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}-\frac{1}{p(x)}\right)\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x)\right|\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\le\left(\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}-\frac{1}{p(x)}\right)^p|\nabla\varphi|^p\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/p}\left(\int_\Omega|\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)|^q\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/q}\\&\le C\left(\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}-\frac{1}{p(x)}\right)^p|\nabla\varphi|^p\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/p},\quad\frac1p+\frac1q=1\,.\end{aligned}$$

Now, we use the asymptotic behavior of u_ε^2, which converges pointwise to $p(x)$ and remains uniformly bounded from above and below. Therefore, Lebesgue convergence theorem yields the desired convergence.
To complete the proof, we refer to [1, Lemma 3.1] to find the uniform convergence of G_ε to G_0. □

Next we cite a result from [6, Lemma 5.5].

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $(f_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in]0,1]}\subset C([0,1],\mathbb{R}_+)$ *be a family of continuous functions. Assume that there exists a constant* $C>0$ *such that*

$$\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^1([0,1])}\leq C\ln|\ln\varepsilon|\,,\quad\forall\ \varepsilon\in]0,1]\,.$$

There exist constants $K>0$ *and* $c_0\in]0,1[$ *such that, given a family* $(N(\varepsilon))\subset\mathbb{N}$ *satisfying* $N(\varepsilon)\gg 1$*, there exists a family* $(\delta(\varepsilon))\subset]0,1[$ *and a sequence* $(t^\varepsilon_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\subset]0,1[$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned}&|f_\varepsilon(t^\varepsilon_i)|\leq K\ln|\ln\varepsilon|\,,\quad\frac{c_0}{N(\varepsilon)}\leq\left|t^\varepsilon_{i+1}-t^\varepsilon_i\right|\leq\delta(\varepsilon)+\frac{c_0}{N(\varepsilon)}\,,\\&\forall\ i\in\{1,2,\cdots,N(\varepsilon)\}\,,\quad\forall\ \varepsilon\in]0,1]\,.\end{aligned}$$

The next proposition provides us with points enjoying useful properties. These points will serve to be the centers of the vortices of the test configuration that we shall construct in the next section.

Proposition 3.5. *Let* $\mu\in C^0_0(\Omega)$ *be continuous and compactly supported in* Ω*. Assume that* $(n(\varepsilon))_{\varepsilon\in(0,1]}\subset\mathbb{N}$ *is a family of integers such that* $c_1|\ln\varepsilon|\leq n(\varepsilon)\leq c_2\varepsilon^{-2}$ *for constants* c_1 *and* c_2 *independent of* $\varepsilon\in(0,1]$*.*
If the restriction $\tilde\mu$ *of* μ *to* S_1 *(respectively* S_2*) is different from* 0*, then there exist constants* $c>0$*,* $C>0$*, a family of integers* $N(\varepsilon)\in\mathbb{N}$*, points* a^ε_i *in* S_1 *(respectively* S_2*) and degrees* $d^\varepsilon_i=\pm1$ *such that:*

1. $N(\varepsilon)=n(\varepsilon)(1+o(1))$ *as* $\varepsilon\to0$ *;*
2. $|a^\varepsilon_i-a^\varepsilon_j|\geq\dfrac{C}{\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}}\geq c\varepsilon$ *for all* $i\neq j$ *;*
3. $\operatorname{dist}(a^\varepsilon_i,\partial S_1)\geq\dfrac{\ln|\ln\varepsilon|}{|\ln\varepsilon|}$ *and* $\operatorname{dist}(a^\varepsilon_i,\partial\Omega)>c$ *for all* i *;*
4. $|v_\varepsilon(a^\varepsilon_i,a^\varepsilon_i)|\ll|\ln\varepsilon|$ *for all* i *;*
5. $\dfrac{1}{N(\varepsilon)}\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N(\varepsilon)}\mu^\varepsilon_i\rightharpoonup2\pi\frac{\tilde\mu}{\|\tilde\mu\|}$ *in the weak sense of measures, for* μ^ε_i *any measure supported in* $\overline{B(a^\varepsilon_i,c\varepsilon)}$*, of constant sign, and such that* $\mu^\varepsilon_i(\Omega)=2\pi d^\varepsilon_i$*.*

Proof. For $i=1,2$, we denote by $S^\varepsilon_i=\{x\in S_i\ :\ \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial S_1)\geq\frac{\ln|\ln\varepsilon|}{|\ln\varepsilon|}\}$. We only present the construction in S^ε_1 as it holds exactly in S^ε_2.
We partition S^ε_1 into squares K of side-length $\ell(\varepsilon)$ where $\ell(\varepsilon)$ is chosen such that,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}}\ll\ell(\varepsilon)\ll1\quad\text{as }\varepsilon\to0\,.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)$ the family of such squares that lie entirely inside S^ε_1.
For $K\in\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)$, we set

$$\lambda_K=n(\varepsilon)\frac{|\mu(K)|}{M_\varepsilon}\,,$$

where

$$M_\varepsilon=\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)}|\mu(K)|\,.$$

Since μ is continuous with compact support in Ω, and $\ell(\varepsilon)$ tends to 0 as $\varepsilon\to0$, we get that $M_\varepsilon\to\|\tilde\mu\|$ as $\varepsilon\to0$.
Now $\displaystyle\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)}\lambda_K=n$, hence Lemma 7.4 of [11] provides us with nonnegative integers $m_\varepsilon(K)$ such that

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)}m_\varepsilon(K)=n(\varepsilon)\,,\tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\left|m_\varepsilon(K) - n\frac{|\mu(K)|}{M_\varepsilon}\right| < 1\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Since μ is bounded, we may find $M > 0$ such that $|\mu|(K) \leq M\ell(\varepsilon)^2$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)$. Consequently, we infer from (3.5) that

$$m_\varepsilon(K) \leq 1 + nM\ell^2 = \mathcal{O}(nM\ell^2)\,,$$

(recall that $\frac{1}{n} \ll \ell \ll 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$).
Now we decompose $\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{K}_1(\varepsilon) \cup \mathcal{K}_2(\varepsilon)$, where $K \in \mathcal{K}_2(\varepsilon)$ if and only if $\operatorname{dist}(\partial K, \partial S_1) \geq \frac{R}{2}$ where $R > 0$ is picked small enough so that each connected component of S_1 contains a disc of radius R.
Now assume that $K \in \mathcal{K}_1(\varepsilon)$. Let $p_\varepsilon(K)$ be the least integer less than $\sqrt{m_\varepsilon(K)}$. Then we may pick $p_\varepsilon(K)$ points b_i^ε lying on one side $\mathcal{L}$ of K and such that

$$|b_i^\varepsilon - b_j^\varepsilon| \geq \frac{C\ell(\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{p_\varepsilon(K)}} \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}}\,. \tag{3.6}$$

Next, we can construct $p_\varepsilon(K)$ segments L_i^ε in K, each passing by b_i^ε and perpendicular to the side $\mathcal{L}$ (hence each L_i has length $\ell(\varepsilon)$).
Since $K \in \mathcal{K}_1(\varepsilon)$, we may find closed smooth curves $\gamma_i \supset L_i$ in Ω such that each γ_i is the boundary of a simply connected set $U_i \subset \Omega$ and $2\pi R \leq |\gamma_i| \leq |\partial S_1|$. By this way, referring to [6, Proof of (5.4)], we may get a constant $C' > 0$ independent from ε and such that, for all i,

$$\int_{\gamma_i} |v_\varepsilon(x,x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C' \ln|\ln\varepsilon|\,.$$

In particular, it holds that

$$\int_{L_i} |v_\varepsilon(x,x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C' \ln|\ln\varepsilon|\,.$$

Let us parameterize L_i by $(0, \ell(\varepsilon)] \ni s \mapsto x(s) \in L_i$, and let us define the rescaled continuous function

$$(0,1] \ni t \mapsto f_\varepsilon(t) = v_\varepsilon\left(x(\ell(\varepsilon)t), x(\ell(\varepsilon)t)\right)\,,$$

so that $\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(0,1)} \leq C''(\ell(\varepsilon))^{-1}\ln|\ln\varepsilon|$. Invoking the result of Lemma 3.4, we may pick $p_\varepsilon(K)$ points $(b_{i,j}^\varepsilon) \subset L_i$ such that[2]

$$|v_\varepsilon(b_{i,j}^\varepsilon, b_{i,j}^\varepsilon)| \leq K'\frac{\ln|\ln\varepsilon|}{\ell(\varepsilon)}$$

and

$$|b_{i,j}^\varepsilon - b_{i,k}^\varepsilon| \geq \frac{c_0}{\ell(\varepsilon)\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}} \geq \frac{c_0}{\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}}\,.$$

Denoting by (a_k^ε) the family of the constructed points in all the segments L_i, we have actually constructed $[p_\varepsilon(K)]^2$ points $(a_k^\varepsilon) \subset K$ such that

$$|v_\varepsilon(a_k^\varepsilon, a_k^\varepsilon)| \leq K'\frac{\ln|\ln\varepsilon|}{\ell(\varepsilon)}\,,\quad |a_k^\varepsilon - a_j^\varepsilon| \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}}\,.$$

Recalling the assumptions on $n(\varepsilon)$ and $\ell(\varepsilon)$, we get actually the two desired properties (2) and (3) stated in Proposition 3.5 above, with the constant $c > 0$ chosen sufficiently small that $c < \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp}\mu\,, \partial\Omega)$.
It remains now to continue the construction of the points (a_i^ε) filling the squares $K \in \mathcal{K}_2(\varepsilon)$. Notice that Corollary 5.3 of [6] (more precisely an adjustment of its

---

[2] We apply the lemma with $N(\varepsilon) = \sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}$ so that we get $\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)} \geq p_\varepsilon(K)$ points.

proof) provides us with a constant $C>0$ such that, for all $K\in\mathcal{K}_2(\varepsilon)$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$, we have,

$$\|v_\varepsilon(x,x)\|_{L^\infty(K)}\leq C\,.$$

Hence, it is sufficient to construct any well separated $m_\varepsilon(K)$ points in this case. This is exactly the case of [11, p. 144]. Now, the integer $N(\varepsilon)$ is defined as

$$N(\varepsilon)=\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}_1(\varepsilon)}(p_\varepsilon(K))^2+\sum_{K\in\mathcal{K}_2(\varepsilon)}m_\varepsilon(K)\,.$$

That $N(\varepsilon)=n(\varepsilon)(1+o(1))$ is due to the assumption we made on $\ell(\varepsilon)$, $\sqrt{n(\varepsilon)}^{-1}\ll\ell(\varepsilon)\ll 1$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$.
Now, having constructed the family of points (a_i^ε), we see that property (3) stated in Proposition 3.5 is just due to our construction of the points being in S^1_ε, and our choice of the constant c being so small that $\mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{supp}\,\mu\,,\partial\Omega)>c$.
Now we define the family (d_i). If $\mu(K)\geq 0$, we assign the degree $d_i=1$ to each $a_i\in K$, otherwise we associate the degree $d_i=-1$. The proof of the last property (5) in Proposition 3.5 is exactly as that given in [11, p. 145]. □

Proposition 3.5 will be used in the following context. Let $\mu\in C^0_0(\Omega)$ be continuous and compactly supported in Ω. Take positive integers $n_1(\varepsilon)$ and $n_2(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$c_1|\ln\varepsilon|\leq n_1(\varepsilon)+n_2(\varepsilon)\leq c_2\varepsilon^{-2}\,,$$

for positive constants c_1 and c_2 independent from ε.
If the restrictions $\check{\mu}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ of μ to S_1 and S_2 respectively are both different from 0, then we get $N_1(\varepsilon)\sim n_1(\varepsilon)$ points (a_i^ε) in S_1 and $N_2(\varepsilon)\sim n_2(\varepsilon)$ points (b_i^ε) in S_2 satisfying properties (1)-(5) of Proposition 3.5. In particular, we set

$$x_i^\varepsilon=\begin{cases} a_i^\varepsilon & \forall\, i\in\{1,2,\cdots,n_1(\varepsilon)\}\,,\\ b_i^\varepsilon & \forall\, i\in\{n_1(\varepsilon)+1,n_2(\varepsilon)+2,\cdots,n_1(\varepsilon)+n_2(\varepsilon)\}\,,\end{cases}$$

and we define the measures μ_i^ε by

$$\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)=\begin{cases}\dfrac{2d_i}{c^2\varepsilon^2} & \text{if } x\in B(x_i^\varepsilon,c\varepsilon)\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\,.\end{cases}\tag{3.7}$$

If $\check{\mu}$ (respectively $\hat{\mu}$) is zero, we may still choose the points a_i^ε (respectively b_i^ε) arbitrarily so that properties (1)-(4) of Proposition 3.5 are valid, and we define the corresponding measures μ_i^ε to be zero by pure convention.
With these notations, we get as an immediate consequence that

$$\mu_\varepsilon:=\frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)}\sum_{i=1}^{N_1(\varepsilon)+N_2(\varepsilon)}\mu_i^\varepsilon\rightharpoonup 2\pi\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}\quad\text{in } (C_0^{0,\gamma}(\Omega))^*\,,\tag{3.8}$$

where

$$n(\varepsilon)=\begin{cases} N_1(\varepsilon) & \text{if}\quad \mathrm{supp}\,\mu\subset\overline{S}_1\,,\\ N_2(\varepsilon) & \text{if}\quad \mathrm{supp}\,\mu\subset\overline{S}_2\,,\\ N_1(\varepsilon)+N_2(\varepsilon) & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\tag{3.9}$$

Lemma 3.6. *Under the hypotheses and notations above, one has*
(3.10)

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to0}\left(\frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)}\right)^2\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{B_i\times B_j}G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon(y)\leq\frac{4\pi^2}{\|\mu\|^2}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega}G_0(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\,.$$

Here, for all i, B_i denotes the ball $B(x_i^\varepsilon,c\,\varepsilon)$.

Proof. Given $\alpha > 0$, let $\Delta_\alpha = \{(x,y),\ |x-y| < \alpha\}$. We have the following decomposition,

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{B_i\times B_j} G_\varepsilon\, \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon = \int_{\Omega\times\Omega\setminus\Delta_\alpha} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{\Delta_\alpha} G_\varepsilon\, \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon\,. \tag{3.11}$$

Knowing from Lemma 3.3 that G_ε converges uniformly to G_0 in $\Omega\times\Omega\setminus\Delta_\alpha$, we write using (3.8),

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\setminus\Delta_\alpha} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon = \frac{4\pi^2}{\|\mu\|^2}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\setminus\Delta_\alpha} G_0 \mathrm{d}\mu\, \mathrm{d}\mu\,. \tag{3.12}$$

Let us estimate now the last term on the right hand side of (3.11). Since the supports of μ_i^ε and μ_j^ε are disjoint for $i\neq j$, we may write by Lemma 3.2,

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{\Delta_\alpha} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon\right| \leq \frac{C}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{\Delta_\alpha} |\ln|x-y||\,|\mu_i^\varepsilon|(x)\,|\mu_j^\varepsilon|(y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\,,$$

where $C>0$ is a constant independent from α and ε.
Proposition 3.5 provides us that the points a_i^ε are well separated, i.e. $|a_i^\varepsilon - a_j^\varepsilon| \geq \dfrac{C}{\sqrt{n}}$. This actually permits us to write (see [11, p. 147] for details),

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{\Delta_\alpha} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon\right| \leq C\int_{\Delta_\alpha} (|\ln|x-y|| + 1)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\,. \tag{3.13}$$

Substituting (3.12) and (3.13) in (3.11), we deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{B_i\times B_j} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon(y) \quad &\leq \quad \frac{4\pi^2}{\|\mu\|^2}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\setminus\Delta_\alpha} G_0 \mathrm{d}\mu\,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\qquad + C\int_{\Delta_\alpha}(|\ln|x-y||+1)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\,,\end{aligned}$$

with α being arbitrary in the interval $(0,1)$. Making $\alpha\to 0$ (recall that $\ln|x-y|$ is in L^1), we obtain the desired bound of the lemma. ☐

Definition 3.7. *A family of points $(a_i)\subset\Omega$ satisfying Properties (2)-(4) stated in Proposition 3.5 is said to be a well-distributed family.*

Now, let $h_\varepsilon : \Omega \longrightarrow]0,1[$ be the solution of the equation:

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla h_\varepsilon\right) + h_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega\,, \quad h_\varepsilon = 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \tag{3.14}$$

where u_ε is introduced in Theorem 2.1. We define also,

$$J_0(\varepsilon) = \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}|\nabla h_\varepsilon|^2 + |h_\varepsilon - 1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{3.15}$$

Next, we state a remarkable energy-splitting due to Bethuel-Rivière [2]. We find it in [6, Lemma 5.7].

Lemma 3.8. *Consider $(\varphi, A)\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})\times H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$ and define*

$$A' = A - \frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon.$$

Then we have the decomposition of the energy,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) = H^2 J_0(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A') + \mathcal{R}_0 + 2H\int_\Omega (h_\varepsilon - 1)\mu(\varphi, A'), \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = H^2\int_\Omega \frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}(|\varphi|^2-1)|\nabla h_\varepsilon|^2, \qquad \mu(\varphi, A') = h' + \mathrm{curl}(i\varphi\,,\,(\nabla - iA')\varphi). \tag{3.17}$$

Here, the functional $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}$ *is*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A') = \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^2|(\nabla - iA')\varphi|^2 + |\mathrm{curl}\,A'|^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}u_\varepsilon^4(1-|\varphi|^2)^2. \tag{3.18}$$

Lemma 3.9. *Given* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$*, a well-distributed family*[3] *of* $n = n_1 + n_2$ *points* $(a_i) \subset \Omega$ *(*n_i *points in* S_ε^i*) together with degrees* $(d_i) \subset \{-1,1\}$*, there exists a configuration* (φ, A) *such that,* μ_i^ε *being the uniform measure on* $\partial B_i = \partial B(a_i, c\varepsilon)$ *of mass* $2\pi d_i$*, and letting*

$$\mu^\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^\varepsilon,$$

we have for some $\alpha \in [0,1[$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A') &\le c\varepsilon^\alpha n|\ln\varepsilon|^2 + c'n\; o(|\ln\varepsilon|) + 2\pi|\ln\varepsilon|\sum_{i=1}^n p(a_i)\\ &\quad + \sum_{i\neq j}\int\int G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon(y) + \mathcal{O}(n),\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A) &= \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A') + H^2J_0(\varepsilon) + 2H\int_\Omega (h_\varepsilon - 1)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(n\varepsilon H + n\varepsilon^2H^2 + (n^{\frac12}\varepsilon H + \varepsilon H^2)\sqrt{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Moreover, for any $0 < \gamma \le 1$*, it holds that,*

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\mu(\varphi,A) - \mu\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\Omega)} \le C\varepsilon^\gamma\left(1 + \varepsilon H + \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')}{n}}\right). \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. We construct a test configuration (φ, A). We define a function h in Ω by $h = h' + Hh_\varepsilon$ where h_ε has been introduced in (3.14) and h' is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\left(\dfrac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla h'\right) + h' = \mu^\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega,\\ h' = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega.\end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

Note that $h'(x) = \int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu^\varepsilon(y)$. As a consequence, we have

$$\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla h'|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2} + |h'|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega\int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y). \tag{3.23}$$

Now we define an induced magnetic potential $A = A' + \frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon$ by taking simply

$$\mathrm{curl}\,A' = h'.$$

This choice is always possible as one can take $A' = \nabla^\perp g$ with $g \in H^2(\Omega)$ such that $\Delta g = h'$. We turn now to define an order parameter φ which we take in the form

$$\varphi = \rho\, e^{i\phi}, \tag{3.24}$$

where ρ is defined by

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad x \in \cup_i B(a_i, c\varepsilon),\\ 1 & \text{if} \quad x \notin \cup_i B(a_i, 2c\varepsilon),\\ \dfrac{|x-a_i|}{\varepsilon} - 1 & \text{if} \quad \exists\, i \text{ s.t. } x \in B(a_i,2c\varepsilon)\setminus B(a_i,c\varepsilon).\end{cases} \tag{3.25}$$

---

[3] See Definition 3.7 above.

The phase ϕ is defined (modulo 2π) by the relation:

$$\nabla\phi - A' = -\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h' \quad \text{in } \Omega\setminus\cup_i B(a_i,c\varepsilon), \tag{3.26}$$

and we emphasize here that we do not need to define ϕ in regions where ρ vanishes. Having defined (φ, A) as above, we estimate $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A') = \int_\Omega \left(u_\varepsilon^2|\nabla\rho|^2 + \rho^2 u_\varepsilon^2|\nabla\phi - A'|^2 + |h'|^2 + \frac{u_\varepsilon^4}{2\varepsilon^2}(1-\rho^2)^2\right)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.27}$$

From (3.25) and using the uniform upper bound of u_ε, it follows easily that,

$$\int_\Omega \left(u_\varepsilon^2|\nabla\rho|^2 + \frac{u_\varepsilon^4}{2\varepsilon^2}(1-\rho^2)^2\right)\mathrm{d}x \leq Cn. \tag{3.28}$$

Thanks to (3.25), (3.26) and the definition of $h = h' + Hh_\varepsilon$, we have,

$$u_\varepsilon^2\rho^2|\nabla\phi - A'|^2 \leq u_\varepsilon^2|\nabla\varphi - A'|^2 = \frac{|\nabla(h-Hh_\varepsilon)|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2} \quad \text{in } \Omega\setminus\cup_i B(a_i,c\varepsilon).,$$

Replacing this in (3.27) and invoking (3.28), we find,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A') \leq \int_\Omega \left(\frac{|\nabla(h-Hh_\varepsilon)|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2} + |h-Hh_\varepsilon|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x + \mathcal{O}(n). \tag{3.29}$$

Thanks to (3.23), we deduce the upper bound,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A') \leq \int_{\Omega\times\Omega} G_\varepsilon d\mu(x)d\mu(y) + \mathcal{O}(n)\,. \tag{3.30}$$

We now decompose the double integral in two,

$$\int_{\Omega\times\Omega} G_\varepsilon d\mu^\varepsilon(x)d\mu^\varepsilon(y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{B_i\times B_i} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y) + \sum_{i\neq j}\int_{B_i\times B_j} G_\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_j^\varepsilon(y). \tag{3.31}$$

Let us estimate the first term in the right hand side. Writing $G_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon - \frac{u_\varepsilon^2}{2\pi}\ln|x-y|$, we have

$$\int_{B_i\times B_i} G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y) = \int_{B_i\times B_i}\left(v_\varepsilon(x,y) - \frac{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}{2\pi}\ln|x-y|\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y), \tag{3.32}$$

Assuming $(x,y)\in \operatorname{supp}\mu_i\times\operatorname{supp}\mu_i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_i\times B_i} & u_\varepsilon^2(x)\ln|x-y|\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y)\\ &= \int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} u_\varepsilon^2(a_i + c\varepsilon e^{i\theta_1})\ln|c\varepsilon e^{i\theta_1} - c\varepsilon e^{i\theta_2}|\mathrm{d}\theta_1\mathrm{d}\theta_2\\ &= c_\varepsilon + 2\pi\ln\varepsilon\int_0^{2\pi} u_\varepsilon^2(a_i+c\varepsilon e^{i\theta_1})d\theta_1\,.\end{aligned}$$

Here and in the sequel, c_ε or C_ε denote constants bounded (uniformly in ε) from below and above, and that may change from one line to another.
The points a_i being away from the boundary of S_1, Lemma 2.2 gives that $u_\varepsilon^2(a_i + c\varepsilon e^{i\theta_1})$ is exponentially close to $p(a_i)$. Thus, we may write, upon considering the summation,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_{B_i\times B_i}\frac{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}{2\pi}\ln|x-y|\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y) = C_\varepsilon n + \ln\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^n p(a_i)\,. \tag{3.33}$$

Let us now estimate $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{B_i\times B_i}|v_\varepsilon(x,y)|\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y)$. Referring to Corollary 5.3 in [6], we know that for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and all $\eta\in(0,1)$,

$$\|v_\varepsilon(\cdot,y)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\{x\in\Omega\,:\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial S_1)\geq\eta\}}\leq\frac{C_\alpha}{\eta^2}\,.$$

Consequently, the following estimate holds,

(3.34)

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{B_i\times B_i}|v_\varepsilon(x,y)|\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y)&\leq\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{B_i\times B_i}\left(|v_\varepsilon(a_i,a_i)|+C\frac{\varepsilon^\alpha}{\eta^2}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y)\\&=4\pi^2Cn\frac{\varepsilon^\alpha}{\eta^2}+4\pi^2n|v_\varepsilon(a_i,a_i)|,\end{aligned}$$

with $\eta=\frac{2\ln|\ln\varepsilon|}{|\ln\varepsilon|}$.
By our hypotheses, we know that $|v_\varepsilon(a_i,a_i)|\ll|\ln\varepsilon|$. Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{B_i\times B_i}|v_\varepsilon(x,y)|\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_i^\varepsilon(y)\leq c\varepsilon^\alpha n|\ln\varepsilon|^2+c'n\;o(|\ln\varepsilon|).\tag{3.35}$$

Combining (3.33) together with (3.35), we get (3.19).
The proof of the properties (3.20)- (3.21) are exactly as that given in [11, p. 140-142]. □

3.3. **Proof of proposition 3.1, completed.** We first assume $\mu\neq0$ is a continuous and compactly supported function. Let $n_1=[\frac{H}{2\pi}|\mu|(S_1)]$ and $n_2=[\frac{H}{2\pi}|\mu|(S_2)]$ where $[\cdot]$ denotes the integer part. We take $n=n_1+n_2$. Since S_1 and S_2 are disjoint and cover Ω, we have $\|\mu\|=|\mu|(\Omega)=|\mu|(S_1)+|\mu|(S_2)$ and consequently,

$$\frac{n}{H}\backsim\frac{\|\mu\|}{2\pi}.\tag{3.36}$$

Proposition 3.5 provides us with a well-distributed family of points that serves as an input in Lemma 3.9. Thus, we get configurations $(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)$ and associated measures μ_i^ε such that

$$\mu_\varepsilon:=\frac{1}{H}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1+n_2}\mu_i^\varepsilon\rightharpoonup\mu\,,\quad\text{weakly in }\left(C_0^{0,\gamma}\right)^*\,,$$

and the estimates (3.10), (3.19)-(3.20) and (3.21) being all valid.
Since H has the order of $|\ln\varepsilon|$, Lemma 3.6 and estimates (3.19)-(3.36) yield,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')\leq2\pi|\ln\varepsilon|\sum_{i=1}^{n}p(a_i)+4\pi^2\frac{n^2}{\|\mu\|^2}\int_\Omega\int_\Omega G_0(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)+o(H^2),$$

Inserting the particular choices of n_1, n_2, $n=n_1+n_2$ and using the definition of p being piecewise constant,we get,

(3.37)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')\leq H|\ln\varepsilon|\int_\Omega p(x)|\mu|(x)\mathrm{d}x+H^2\int_\Omega\int_\Omega G_0(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)+o(H^2).$$

Again the hypothesis on $H=\mathcal{O}(|\ln\varepsilon|)$ gives that the remainder terms in (3.20) are $o(1)$, leading thus to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)\quad&\leq\quad H^2J_0(\varepsilon)+H|\ln\varepsilon|\int_\Omega p(x)|\mu|(x)\mathrm{d}x\\&\qquad+2H^2\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon+H^2\int_\Omega\int_\Omega G_0(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)+o(H^2).\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.15), we rewrite the preceding formula in the following explicit form,

(3.38)
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)\leq H^2\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla h_\varepsilon|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2}+|h_\varepsilon-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x+H|\ln\varepsilon|\int_\Omega p(x)|\mu|(x)\mathrm{d}x\\ +2H^2\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)\mathrm{d}\mu+H^2\int_{\Omega\times\Omega}G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\\ +2H^2\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)(\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon-\mathrm{d}\mu)+H^2\int_{\Omega\times\Omega}(G_0-G_\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}\mu+o(H^2).\end{aligned}$$

Let us define the functions $U_{\mu,\varepsilon}$ and $h_{\mu,\varepsilon}$ by

$$\left\{\begin{aligned}-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla U_{\mu,\varepsilon}\right)+U_{\mu,\varepsilon}=\mu\quad&\text{in }\Omega,\\ U_{\mu,\varepsilon}=0\quad&\text{on }\partial\Omega.\end{aligned}\right.\tag{3.39}$$

$$\left\{\begin{aligned}-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla h_{\mu,\varepsilon}\right)+h_{\mu,\varepsilon}=\mu\quad&\text{in }\Omega,\\ h_{\mu,\varepsilon}=1\quad&\text{on }\partial\Omega.\end{aligned}\right.\tag{3.40}$$

Remarking that $U_{\mu,\varepsilon}(x)=\displaystyle\int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)$, we get as a consequence

$$\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla U_{\mu,\varepsilon}|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2}+|U_{\mu,\varepsilon}|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x=\int_\Omega\int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(x,y)\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\,.\tag{3.41}$$

Writing $h_{\mu,\varepsilon}-1=U_{\mu,\varepsilon}+h_\varepsilon-1$ and replacing (3.41) in in (3.38) leads, after some calculations to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)}{H^2}\leq\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla h_{\mu,\varepsilon}|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2}+|h_{\mu,\varepsilon}-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x+\frac{|\ln\varepsilon|}{H}\int_\Omega p(x)\,|\mu|(x)\mathrm{d}x\\ +2\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)(\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon-\mathrm{d}\mu)+\int_{\Omega\times\Omega}(G_0-G_\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}\mu+o(1).\end{aligned}\tag{3.42}$$

We define h_μ by

$$\left\{\begin{aligned}-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_\mu\right)+h_\mu=\mu\quad&\text{in }\Omega,\\ h_\mu=1\quad&\text{on }\partial\Omega.\end{aligned}\right.\tag{3.43}$$

By a standard compactness argument similar to that given to Lemma 3.3, we check that,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\longrightarrow0}\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla h_{\mu,\varepsilon}|^2}{u_\varepsilon^2}+|h_{\mu,\varepsilon}-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x=\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla h_\mu|^2}{p(x)}+|h_\mu-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x.\tag{3.44}$$

Using a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows from Lemma 3.3 and the boundedness of μ that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\longrightarrow0}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega}(G_0-G_\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}\mu=0.\tag{3.45}$$

Next, noticing that $\|h_\varepsilon-1\|_{C_0^0(\Omega)}\leq1$, it follows immediately from the convergence of μ_ε to μ in $(C_0^0(\Omega))^*$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\longrightarrow0}\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)(\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon-\mathrm{d}\mu)=0\,.\tag{3.46}$$

Replacing (3.44)-(3.46) in (3.42) then using $\displaystyle\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\frac{H}{|\ln\varepsilon|}=\lambda$, we get finally,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\longrightarrow0}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)}{H^2}\leq\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega p(x)|\mu|(x)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}|\nabla h_\mu|^2+|h_\mu-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Moreover, since (3.21) holds and $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')\leq C|\ln\varepsilon|^2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{H}\|\mu(\varphi,A)-\mu_\varepsilon\|_{(C_0^{0,\gamma}(\Omega))^*}\leq C\varepsilon^\gamma\left(1+\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A')}{n}}\right)\leq o(1).$$

We conclude that (3.1) holds, which finishes the proof in the case where μ is a continuous and compactly supported function. The general case where $\mu\in\mathcal{M}(\Omega)\cap H^{-1}(\Omega)$ follows by a standard approximation argument, see [11, p. 149] for details.

4. Lower Bound

4.1. **Main result.** The objective of this section is to prove the lower bound stated in Proposition 4.1 below.

Given a family of configurations $\{(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)\}$, we denote by

$$j_\varepsilon=(i\varphi_\varepsilon,(\nabla-iA_\varepsilon)\varphi_\varepsilon)\,,\quad h_\varepsilon=\operatorname{curl}A_\varepsilon\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that* $\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\dfrac{H}{|\ln\varepsilon|}=\lambda$ *with* $\lambda>0$. *Let* $\{(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)\}_n$ *be a family of configurations satisfying* $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)\leq CH^2$ *and* $\|\varphi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\leq1$ *for a given constant* $C>0$.

Then, up to the extraction of a subsequence ε_n *converging to* 0, *one has,*

$$\forall\,\gamma\in(0,1)\quad\frac{\mu(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n},A_{\varepsilon_n})}{H}\to\mu\quad\text{in}\ \left(C^{0,\gamma}(\Omega)\right)^*\,,$$

$$\frac{j_{\varepsilon_n}}{H}\rightharpoonup j\,,\quad\frac{h_{\varepsilon_n}}{H}\rightharpoonup h\quad\text{weakly in }L^2(\Omega)\,.$$

Moreover, $\mu=\operatorname{curl}j+h$ *and*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to0}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)}{H^2}\geq E_\lambda(\mu)+\int_\Omega\left(p(x)\left|j+\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla^\perp h_\mu\right|^2+|h-h_\mu|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{4.2}$$

Here, the energy E_λ *and the function* h_μ *are introduced in (1.5) and (1.4) respectively.*

4.2. **Vortex-balls.** In this section we construct suitable 'vortex-balls' providing a lower bound of the energy of minimizers of (1.1). Recall the decomposition of the energy in Lemma 2.3, which permits us to work with the 'reduced energy functional' $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$.

Notice that, by using $(u_\varepsilon,0)$ as a test configuration for the function (1.1), we deduce an upper bound of the form :

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)\leq CH^2\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\varphi=\psi/u_\varepsilon$, (ψ,A) a minimizer of (1.1), and $C>0$ a positive constant.

We recall the hypothesis that there exists a positive constant $C>0$ such that the applied magnetic field H satisfies

$$H\leq C|\ln\varepsilon|\,. \tag{4.4}$$

The upper bound (4.3) provides us, as in [11], with the construction of suitable 'vortex-balls'.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume the hypotheses (4.4). Given an open set* $U\subset\Omega$ *and a number* $p\in]1,2[$, *there exists a constant* $C>0$ *and a finite family of disjoint balls* $\{B((a_i,r_i)\}_{i\in I}$ *such that,* (φ,A) *being a configuration satisfying the bound (4.3), the following properties hold:*

1. $\overline{B(a_i,r_i)}\subset U$ *for all* i *;*
2. $w=\{x\in U\ :\ |\varphi(x)|\leq1-|\ln\varepsilon|^{-4}\}\subset\bigcup_{i\in I}B(a_i,r_i)$.

(3) $\sum_{i\in I} r_i \leq C\,|\ln\varepsilon|^{-10}$.

(4) *Letting* d_i *be the degree of the function* $\varphi/|\varphi|$ *restricted to* $\partial B(a_i,r_i)$ *if* $B(a_i,r_i)\subset\Omega$ *and* $d_i=0$ *otherwise, then we have:*

$$\int_{B(a_i,r_i)\setminus\omega} u_\varepsilon^2|(\nabla-iA)\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{B(a_i,r_i)}|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\geq 2\pi|d_i|\left(\min_{B(a_i,r_i)}u_\varepsilon^2\right)(|\ln\varepsilon|-C\ln|\ln\varepsilon|)\,. \tag{4.5}$$

(5) $\left\|2\pi\sum_{i\in I}d_i\delta_{a_i}-\mathrm{curl}\big(A+(i\varphi,\nabla_A\varphi)\big)\right\|_{W_0^{-1,p}(U)}\leq C|\ln\varepsilon|^{-4}.$

We follow the usual terminology and call the balls constructed in Proposition 4.2 'vortex-balls'. The proof of Proposition 4.2 is actually a simple consequence of the analysis of [11].

4.3. **Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Let us consider smooth and open sets $U_1\subset S_1$ and $U_2\subset S_2$, and let us denote by U their union.
Applying Proposition 4.2 in U_1 and U_2 respectively, we get families of balls $B(a_i,r_i)$ and degrees d_i such that,

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,V_\varepsilon)}{H^2}\geq 2\pi\frac{|\ln\varepsilon|}{H}\sum_i\left(\min_{B(a_i,r_i)}u_\varepsilon^2\right)\frac{|d_i|}{H}+o(1)\,,$$

where $V_\varepsilon=\cup_i B(a_i,r_i)$.
Recall that u_ε^2 converges uniformly to the function p in U. Thus, we may rewrite the above lower bound in the following form,

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,V_\varepsilon)}{H^2}\geq 2\pi\frac{|\ln\varepsilon|}{H}\left(\frac{\sum_{a_i\in U_1}|d_i|}{H}+a\frac{\sum_{a_i\in U_2}|d_i|}{H}\right)+o(1)\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Using the bound $\|\varphi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\leq 1$, we write $|(\nabla-iA_\varepsilon)\varphi_\varepsilon|^2\geq|\varphi_\varepsilon|^2|(\nabla-iA_\varepsilon)|^2\geq|j_\varepsilon|^2$. Consequently, we have,

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,U\setminus V_\varepsilon)}{H^2}\geq\int_{U\setminus V_\varepsilon}\left(u_\varepsilon^2\left|\frac{j_\varepsilon}{H}\right|^2+\left|\frac{h_\varepsilon}{H}-1\right|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{4.7}$$

With $U=\Omega$, we infer from the bound $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)\leq CH^2$ that up to the extraction of a subsequence, $\frac{j_\varepsilon}{H}$ and $\frac{h_\varepsilon}{H}$ respectively converge weakly to j and h in $L^2(\Omega)$. Thanks again to the bound (4.3), we deduce that $\frac{\sum_{a_i\in U_1}|d_i|}{H}$ and $\frac{\sum_{a_i\in U_2}|d_i|}{H}$ are bounded. Hence the measures $\frac{\sum_{a_i\in U_1}d_i\delta_{a_i}}{H}$ and $\frac{\sum_{a_i\in U_2}d_i\delta_{a_i}}{H}$ are weakly compact in the sense of measures, and thus, up to extraction of subsequences, they respectively converge to measures μ_1 and μ_2 in $(C_0^0(U_1))^*$ and $(C_0^0(U_2))^*$. Thanks to the last property of Proposition 4.2, we get upon setting $\mu=\mathrm{curl}\,j+h$,

$$\mu_1=\mu_{|_{U_1}}\,,\quad \mu_2=\mu_{|_{U_2}}\,.$$

Therefore, combining (4.6)-(4.7) and using the uniform convergence of u_ε^2 to p in U, we deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,U)}{H^2} &\geq \frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,V_\varepsilon)}{H^2}+\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,U\setminus V_\varepsilon)}{H^2}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(|\mu|(U_1)+a|\mu|(U_2)\right)+\int_U\left(p(x)|j|^2+|h-1|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x+o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Invoking $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,\Omega)\geq\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,U)$, we deduce that,

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to0}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,\Omega)}{H^2}\geq\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(|\mu|(U_1)+a|\mu|(U_2)\right)+\int_U\left(p(x)|j|^2+|h-1|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{4.8}$$

The left hand side of (4.8) being independent from U, and U_1, U_2 being arbitrary subsets of S_1 and S_2, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to0}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon,\Omega)}{H^2}\geq\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega p(x)\mathrm{d}|\mu|+\int_\Omega\left(p(x)|j|^2+|h-1|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Now to conclude, we write

$$j=-\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla^\perp h_\mu+\left(j+\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla^\perp h_\mu\right)\,,\quad h=h_\mu+(h-h_\mu)\,.$$

Upon substitution in the right hand side of (4.9) and using in particular the remarkable identities

$$\mathrm{curl}\left(j+\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla^\perp h_\mu\right)+h-h_\mu=0\quad\text{in }\Omega\,,\quad h_\mu-1=0\quad\text{on }\partial\Omega\,,$$

we get the desired conclusion (4.2).

Remark 4.3. *Combining the upper and lower bounds of Propositions 3.1 and Proposition 4.1, then by uniqueness of the minimizer μ_* of E_λ (see Section 5 below), it is evident that $\mu_*=\mu$ and $h=h_{\mu_*}$. Here μ and h are given in Proposition 4.1 above.*

5. Minimization of the limiting energy

As we explained in the introduction, by convexity and lower semi-continuity, the limiting energy (1.5) admits a unique minimizer μ_* which is expressed by means of the unique minimizer h_* of (1.6) as follows,

$$\mu_*=-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_*\right)+h_*\,. \tag{5.1}$$

Proceeding as in [12, 11], we may get an equivalent characterization of h_*. We write $H^1_1(\Omega)$ for the space of Sobolev functions u such that $u-1\in H^1_0(\Omega)$.

Proposition 5.1. *The minimizer u_* of*

$$\min_{\substack{u\in H^1_0(\Omega)\\ -\mathrm{div}(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla u)+u\in\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}}\int_\Omega\left(\frac{p(x)}{\lambda}\left|-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla u\right)+u+1\right|+\frac{|\nabla u|^2}{p(x)}+|u|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\,,$$

is also the unique minimizer of the dual problem

$$\min_{\substack{v\in H^1_0(\Omega)\\ |v|\leq\frac{p}{2\lambda}}}\int_\Omega\left(\frac{|\nabla v|^2}{p(x)}+|v|^2+2v\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\,.$$

For instance, $h_*=u_*+1$ minimizes the energy,

$$\min_{\substack{f\in H^1_1(\Omega)\\ (f-1)\geq-\frac{p}{2\lambda}}}\left(\int_\Omega\frac{|\nabla f|^2}{p(x)}+|f|^2\right)\,,$$

and satisfies $-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_*\right)+h_*\geq0$.

Proof. Let us define the lower semi-continuous and convex functional

$$\Phi(u)=\int_\Omega \frac{p(x)}{2\lambda}\left|-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla u\right)+u+1\right|\,\mathrm{d}x$$

in the Hilbert space $H=H_0^1(\Omega)$ endowed with the scalar product $\langle f,g\rangle_H=\int_\Omega \frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla f\cdot\nabla g+fg$. Let us compute its conjugate Φ^*, i.e.

$$\Phi^*(f)=\sup_{\{g\,:\,\Phi(g)<\infty\}}\langle f,g\rangle-\Phi(g)\,.$$

Indeed, we have,

$$\Phi^*(f)\geq\sup_{\eta\in L^2}\int_\Omega f\eta\,\mathrm{d}x-\frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega p(x)|\eta|\,\mathrm{d}x-\int_\Omega f\,\mathrm{d}x\,,$$

from which we deduce that

$$\Phi^*(f)=\begin{cases}-\displaystyle\int_\Omega f\,\mathrm{d}x & \text{if } |f|\leq\frac{p}{2\lambda}\,,\\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

By convex duality (see [11, Lemma 7.2]),

$$\min_{u\in H}\left(\|u\|_H^2+2\Phi(u)\right)=-\min_{f\in H}\left(\|f\|_H^2+2\Phi^*(-f)\right)\,,$$

and minimizers coincide. That the measure $\mu_*=-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_*\right)+h_*$ is positive is actually a consequence of the weak maximum principle, see [8, p. 131]. One may also follow step by step the proof given in [12]. $\square$

Therefore, the limiting vorticity measure μ_* is positive, and following [12], it can be expressed by means of the coincidence set $w_\lambda=w_\lambda^1\cup w_\lambda^2$,

$$w_\lambda^1=\{x\in\overline{S}_1\ :\ 1-h_*(x)=\frac{1}{2\lambda}\}\,,\quad w_\lambda^2=\{x\in\overline{S}_2\ :\ \frac{1-h_*(x)}{a}=\frac{1}{2\lambda}\}\,,\tag{5.2}$$

as follows,

$$\mu_*=\left(1-\frac{p(x)}{2\lambda}\right)\mathbf{1}_{w_\lambda}\mathrm{d}x\,,\tag{5.3}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{w_\lambda}\mathrm{d}x$ denotes the Lebesgue measure restricted to w_λ. Furthermore, h_* (the minimizer of (1.6)) solves,

$$\begin{cases}-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_*\right)+h_*=0 & \text{in }\Omega\setminus w_\lambda\\ h_*=1-\frac{p}{2\lambda} & \text{in } w_\lambda\\ h_*=1 & \text{on }\partial\Omega\,,\end{cases}\tag{5.4}$$

and the regularity of h_* is complicated, as w_λ may intersect the interior boundary ∂S_1 where h_* has gradient singularities (it is expected to satisfy a transmission condition, see the radial case below). But, we know that in the interior of S_1 and S_2, h_* is locally $C^{1,\alpha}$ for some exponent $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Remark for instance that the measure μ_* is no more uniform and may be discontinuous in light of $\mu_*=\left(1-\frac{1}{2\lambda}\right)\mathrm{d}x$ in w_λ^1 and $\mu_*=\left(1-\frac{a}{2\lambda}\right)\mathrm{d}x$ in w_λ^2.

For the sake of a better understanding of the sets w_λ, w_λ^1 and w_λ^2, we introduce the following critical constants (we emphasize their dependence on the material parameter a),

$$\lambda_i(a)=\frac{1}{2\max\limits_{x\in\overline{S_i}}\left(\dfrac{1-h_0(x)}{p(x)}\right)},\quad\forall\, i\in\{1,2\}\,,\quad\lambda_0(a)=\min(\lambda_1(a),\lambda_2(a))\,.\tag{5.5}$$

Here we recall that h_0 is the solution of $-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\nabla h_0\right)+h_0=0$ in Ω and $h_0=1$ on $\partial\Omega$. The maximum principle gives that $0<h_0<1$ in Ω. We denote also by $w_0=w_0^1\cup w_0^2$ the set $w_{\lambda_0(a)}=w^1_{\lambda_0(a)}\cup w^2_{\lambda_0(a)}$ introduced in (5.2).
The following proposition follows from a weak maximum principle [8, p. 131], see [12] for a detailed proof (modulo necessary adjustments).

Proposition 5.2. (1) *w_λ is increasing with respect to λ and $\cup_{\lambda>0}w_\lambda=\Omega$;*
(2) *w^1_λ and w^2_λ are disjoint;*
(3) *If $\lambda<\lambda_0(a)$ then $h_*=h_0$, $\mu_*=0$ and $w_\lambda=\emptyset$;*
(4) *If $\lambda=\lambda_0(a)$ then $h_*=h_0$, $\mu_*=0$ and $w_\lambda=w_0$;*
(5) *If $\lambda>\lambda_0(a)$ then $\mu_*\neq 0$;*
(6) *If $\lambda<\lambda_i(a)$ for some $i\in\{1,2\}$, then $w^i_\lambda=\emptyset$.*

Next for the sake of illustrating the above results, we give a detailed analysis of h_0 in the radial case. Let us take $\Omega=D(0,1)$ the unit disc in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $S_1=D(0,R)$ and $S_2=D(0,1)\setminus\overline{D(0,R)}$ where $0<R<1$. In this case h_0 is radially symmetric, $h_0(x)=h_0(|x|)$, and so it solves the following ODE,

$$\tag{5.6}\begin{cases}-h''(r)-r^{-1}h'(r)+h_0(r)=0 & \text{if } 0<r<R\,,\\ -h''(r)-r^{-1}h'(r)+ah_0(r)=0 & \text{if } R<r<1\,,\\ h_0(R_-)=h_0(R_+)\,,\quad h_0'(R_-)=\frac{1}{a}h_0'(R_+)\,,\\ h_0'(0)=0\quad h_0(1)=1\,.\end{cases}$$

We look for a power series solution in the form,

$$h_0(r)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}a_nr^n\quad\text{if } 0<r<R\,,\quad h_0(r)=\sum_{n=0}^{n}b_n(r-R)^n\quad\text{if } R<r<1\,.$$

The sequences (a_n) and (b_n) depend on a and R and all the terms are expressed as functions of the term a_0, the two constants

$$\alpha=1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{R^{2k}}{2^k((k+1)!)^2}\,,\quad \beta=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(2k+2)\frac{R^{2k+1}}{2^k((k+1)!)^2}\,,$$

and the sequence $(\gamma_n(a))$ defined recursively by,

$$\gamma_{-3}(a)=1\,,\quad \gamma_{-2}(a)=-\frac{1}{R}\,,\quad \gamma_{n+1}(a)=-\frac{1}{R}\gamma_n(a)+a\gamma_{n-1}(a)\,,\quad\forall\ n\geq -1\,.$$

Actually, we may verify that,

$$a_{2n+1}=0\,,\quad a_{2n+2}=\frac{a_0}{2^n((n+1)!)^2}\quad\forall\ n\in\mathbb{N}\,,$$

$$b_0=a_0\alpha\,,\quad b_1=a\,a_0\beta\,,\quad b_{n+2}=\frac{1}{(n+2)!}\left(\gamma_{n-2}(a)b_1+a\gamma_{n-3}(a)b_0\right)\quad\forall\ n\geq 2\,,$$

and the term a_0 is expressed explicitly by,

$$a_0=\left[\alpha+a\left(\beta(1-R)+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(n+2)!}\left(\alpha\gamma_{n-2}(a)+\beta\gamma_{n-3}(a)\right)(1-R)^n\right)\right]^{-1}\,,$$

provided that the sum in the r.h.s. is finite. For instance, this is the case when $\frac{1}{2}<R<1$ and $a\to 0_+$. Actually, in the limit $a\to 0_+$, it holds that,

$$a_0\to\alpha^{-1}\,,\quad \frac{1-b_0}{a}\to\alpha^{-1}\left(\beta(1-R)+\frac{\beta-\alpha}{R}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^n}{(n+2)!}\left(\frac{1}{R}-1\right)^n\right)=:c_0\,.$$

For $R \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ chosen conveniently (close to $\frac{1}{2}$), it is easy to verify that $c_0 > 1 - \alpha^{-1}$. Therefore, there exists $a_0 \in (0,1)$ sufficiently small (depending on $R \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$) such that, for all $a \in (0, a_0)$, we have,

$$\lambda_2(a) < \lambda_1(a)\,,$$

where $\lambda_1(a)$ and $\lambda_2(a)$ are the critical constants introduced in (5.5). Coming back to the problem of vortex nucleation for the G-L energy (1.3), we get in light of Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 5.2, that for a wide range of applied magnetic fields,

$$H = \lambda |\ln \varepsilon|(1 + o(1)) \quad (\varepsilon \to 0)\,, \quad \lambda \in (\lambda_2(a), \lambda_1(a))\,,$$

vortices exist and are pinned in S_2. This result is in accordance with that obtained by the second author in [5, 6], where nucleation of vortices near the critical magnetic field (in the case of the disc) is studied in details.

Acknowledgments

Part of this work was carried out while the second author visited Lebanese University. He wishes to thank A. Mneimneh and R. Talhouk for their hospitality.

References

[1] A. Aftalion, E. Sandier, S. Serfaty. Pinning phenomena in the Ginzburg-Landau model of superconductivity. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **80** 339-372 (2001).

[2] F. Béthuel, T. Rivière. Vortices for a variational problem related to superconductivity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **12** (3) 243-303 (1995).

[3] S.J. Chapman, Q. Du, M.D. Gunzburger. A Ginzburg Landau type model of superconducting/normal junctions including Josephson junctions. *European J. Appl. Math.* **6** (2) 97-114 (1996).

[4] T. Giorgi. Superconductors surrounded by normal materials. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sec. A,* **135** 331-356 (2005).

[5] A. Kachmar. Magnetic Ginzburg-Landau functional with disconinuous constraint. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **346** (5-6) 297-300 (2008).

[6] A. Kachmar. Magnetic vortices for a Ginzburg-Landau type energy with disconinuous constraint. (Submitted). `Preprint arxiv.org`

[7] A. Kachmar. On the perfect superconducting solution for a generalized Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Asymptot. Anal.* **54** (3-4) 125-164 (2007).

[8] O. Kavian. *Introduction à la théorie des points critiques et applications aux problèmes critiques.* Springer. Verlag. (1993).

[9] L. Lassoued, P. Mironescu. Ginzburg-Landau type energy with discontinuous constraint. *J. Anal. Math.* **77** 1-26 (1999).

[10] J. Rubinstein. Six lectures in superconductivity, *Boundaries, Interfaces and Transitions. (Banff, AB, 1995),* 163–184, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, **13**. *Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI,* 1998.

[11] E. Sandier, S. Serfaty. *Vortices for the magnetic Ginzburg-Landau model.* Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 70. Birkhäuser Boston, 2007.

[12] E. Sandier, S. Serfaty. A Rigorous Derivation of a Free-Boundary Problem Arising in Superconductivity. *Annales Scientifiques de l'ENS,* **33** (2000), 561-592.

[13] G. Stampacchia. Équations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus. Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures, No. 16 (Été, 1965). *Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, Que. 326 pp. 1966).*

H. Aydi
Université de Monastir, Institut supérieur d'informatique de Mahdia, Km 4, Réjiche, 5121 Mahdia, Tunisie
E-mail address: `hassen.aydi@isima.rnu.tn`

A. Kachmar
Université Paris-Sud, Département de mathématique, Bât. 425, F-91405 Orsay
E-mail address: `ayman.kachmar@math.u-psud.fr`